

Almost All Generalized Extraspecial p -Groups Are Resistant

Radu Stancu¹

*Section de Mathématiques, Université de Genève,
CP 240, CH-1211, Genève 24, Switzerland
E-mail: Radu.Stancu@math.unige.ch*

Communicated by Michel Broué

Received February 7, 2001

A p -group P is called resistant if, for any finite group G having P as a Sylow p -subgroup, the normalizer $N_G(P)$ controls p -fusion in G . The aim of this paper is to prove that any generalized extraspecial p -group P is resistant, excepting the case when $P = E \times A$, where A is elementary abelian and E is dihedral of order 8 (when $p = 2$) or extraspecial of order p^3 and exponent p (when p is odd). This generalizes a result of Green and Minh. © 2002 Elsevier Science (USA)

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a finite group and let H be a subgroup of G . Two elements of H are said to be *fused* in G if they are conjugate in G but not in H . We are interested in p -groups P such that, for any finite group G having P as a Sylow p -subgroup, the p -fusion is controlled only by the normalizer $N_G(P)$ of P (that is, any two elements of P which are fused in G are fused in $N_G(P)$). This is equivalent to the requirement that any such group G does not contain *essential* p -subgroups (Definition 2.2). Following the terminology suggested by Jesper Grodal, we will call such a group *resistant*.

In fact, by a theorem of Mislin [Mi], the notion of *resistant group* is equivalent to what Martino and Priddy [MP] call *Swan group*. We recall that P is a Swan group if, for any G as before, the mod- p cohomology ring $H^*(G)$ is isomorphic to the mod- p cohomology ring $H^*(N_G(P))$.

¹ This work is part of a doctoral thesis in preparation at the University of Lausanne, under the supervision of Prof. Jacques Thévenaz.



In a recent paper [GM], Green and Minh proved that almost all extraspecial p -groups are Swan groups. In our paper, we find the same result for *generalized extraspecial* p -groups (Definition 3.1) and give a proof avoiding cohomological methods.

2. ESSENTIAL GROUPS

Let $\mathcal{F}_p(G)$ be the Frobenius category of a finite group G . We recall that the objects in this category are the nontrivial p -subgroups of G and the morphisms are the group homomorphisms given by the conjugation by elements of G . For a subgroup H of G , we denote by $\mathcal{F}_p(G)_{\leq H}$ the full subcategory of $\mathcal{F}_p(G)$ containing the nontrivial p -subgroups of H .

A natural question is: What is the minimal information needed to completely characterize these morphisms? For a Sylow p -subgroup P of G , Alperin showed in [Al] that these morphisms are locally controlled, i.e., by normalizers $N_G(Q)$ for Q a subgroup of P . Nine years later, Puig [Pu1] refined this and required Q to be an *essential* p -subgroup of G . In what follows, we will give the definition and some basic properties of essential p -subgroups of G .

DEFINITION 2.1. We say that Q is **p -centric** if Q is a Sylow p -subgroup of $QC_G(Q)$ or, equivalently, $Z(Q)$ is a Sylow p -subgroup of $C_G(Q)$.

In the literature [Th, p. 324], a p -centric subgroup is also called p -self-centralizing. Note that if Q is p -centric, then $C_P(Q) = Z(Q)$ for any Sylow p -subgroup P of G containing Q .

Consider now the Quillen complex $\mathcal{S}_p(H)$ of a finite group H whose vertices are the objects in $\mathcal{F}_p(H)$ and whose simplices are given by chains of groups ordered by inclusion.

DEFINITION 2.2. We say that Q is an **essential** subgroup of G if the Quillen complex $\mathcal{S}_p(N_G(Q)/Q)$ is disconnected and $C_G(Q)$ does not act transitively on the connected components.

One can find in [Th, Theorem 48.8] that

PROPOSITION 2.3. Q is an essential p -subgroup of G if and only if Q is p -centric and $\mathcal{S}_p(N_G(Q)/QC_G(Q))$ is disconnected.

The proof has been done in a more general case. In the terminology and notation of [Th, Theorem 48.8], it suffices to replace *local pointed groups* by p -subgroups, $\mathcal{N}_{>Q}$ by $\mathcal{S}_p(N_G(Q))_{>Q}$, and $@G$ by G . In most of the proofs of this paper, we will use this proposition as an alternative definition of essential subgroups. For $g \in G$, we denote by gQ the conjugate by g of Q .

DEFINITION 2.4. We say that a subgroup H of a group G **controls p -fusion** in G if $(|G : H|, p) = 1$ and for any $g \in G$ and any Q , such that Q and gQ are contained in H , there exists $h \in H$ and $c \in C_G(Q)$ such that $g = hc$, or, equivalently, if the inclusion $H \hookrightarrow G$ induces an equivalence of categories $\mathcal{F}_p(H) \simeq \mathcal{F}_p(G)$.

The notions of control of fusion and essential p -subgroups are strongly linked. The next proposition shows one of the aspects of this link.

PROPOSITION 2.5 [Pu1, Ch. IV, Prop. 2]. *The normalizer $N_G(P)$ controls p -fusion in G if and only if there are no essential p -subgroups in G .*

The proof is based on the variant of Alperin's theorem using essential p -subgroups (see, for instance, [Th, Theorem 48.3]) and on the fact that the essential p -subgroups are preserved by any equivalence of categories.

3. GENERALIZED EXTRASPECIAL GROUPS

From now on, C_n will denote the cyclic group of order n .

DEFINITION 3.1. A p -group P is called **generalized extraspecial** if its Frattini subgroup, $\Phi(P)$, has order p , $\Phi(P) = [P, P] \simeq C_p$, and $Z(P) \geq \Phi(P)$. If, moreover, $Z(P) = \Phi(P)$, P is called **extraspecial**.

LEMMA 3.2. *Let P be a generalized extraspecial p -group. Then either $Z(P)$ is isomorphic to $\Phi(P) \times A$ and P is isomorphic to $E \times A$, or $Z(P)$ is isomorphic to $C_{p^2} \times A$ and E is isomorphic to $(E * C_{p^2}) \times A$, where E is an extraspecial p -group, A is an elementary abelian group, and $*$ means central product.*

Proof. As $\Phi(P)$ is a cyclic subgroup of order p , the center $Z(P)$ does not admit more than one factor isomorphic to C_{p^2} in its decomposition in cyclic subgroups, and if this factor exists, it contains $\Phi(P)$. Let A be an elementary abelian subgroup of $Z(P)$ such that $Z(P) \simeq \Phi(P) \times A$, when there is no C_{p^2} factor in $Z(P)$, and $Z(P) \simeq C_{p^2} \times A$, otherwise. We have, in both cases, $[P, P] \cap A = 1$ and $[P, A] = 1$, so A is a direct factor of P . It is then straightforward that the complement of A in P is isomorphic either to E or to $E * C_{p^2}$.

Recall that for $|P| = p^3$, we have that P is isomorphic either to $(C_p \times C_p) \rtimes C_p$ (in this case we say that P is of order p^3 and exponent p) or to $C_{p^2} \rtimes C_p$, for p odd, and either to the dihedral group D_8 or the quaternion group Q_8 , for $p = 2$.

Let $\beta: P/Z(P) \times P/Z(P) \rightarrow \Phi(P)$ defined by $\beta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = [x, y]$. It is a bilinear nondegenerate symplectic form on $U := P/Z(P)$ viewed as a vector

space over \mathbf{F}_p . We recall that an isotropic vector subspace of U with respect to β is a subspace on which β is identically zero. A maximal isotropic subspace of U has dimension equal to half of the dimension of U .

LEMMA 3.3. *Let Q be a p -centric subgroup of P . Then Q contains $Z(P)$ and $Q/Z(P)$ contains a maximal isotropic subspace of $P/Z(P)$.*

Proof. A p -centric subgroup of P clearly contains the center $Z := Z(P)$ of P . Suppose that $V := Q/Z(P)$, considered as vector space, does not contain a maximal isotropic subspace of $U := P/Z(P)$ with respect to β . This means that there exists $u \in U \setminus V$ with $\beta(u, x) = 0, \forall x \in V$. By taking a representative e of u in P , we have $e \in P \setminus Q$ and e commutes with all the elements of Q . So $e \in C_P(Q) \setminus Z(Q)$, which is a contradiction to the fact that Q is p -centric.

4. RESISTANT GROUPS

DEFINITION 4.1. A p -group P is called **resistant** if, for any finite group G such that P is a Sylow p -subgroup of G , the normalizer $N_G(P)$ controls p -fusion in G .

Here is now the main result of this paper.

THEOREM 4.2. *Let P be a generalized extraspecial p -group. Then P is resistant excepting the case when $P = E \times A$, where A is elementary abelian and E is dihedral of order 8 (when $p = 2$) or extraspecial of order p^3 and exponent p (when p is odd).*

COROLLARY 4.3. *If P satisfies the conditions of the theorem, then P is a Swan group.*

Proof of Theorem 4.2. We will prove that the only cases where G contains essential p -subgroups are the exceptions of our theorem. Let Q be a proper p -centric subgroup of P . This forces Q to contain $Z(P)$ and hence also $\Phi := \Phi(P)$. Denote by R the subgroup of $N := (N_G(Q) \cap N_G(\Phi))/C_G(Q)$ acting trivially on Φ and Q/Φ . We have that R centralizes the quotients of the central series $1 \triangleleft \Phi \triangleleft Q$, so it is a normal p -subgroup [Gor, Theorem 5.3.2] of N . Now R contains $P/Z(Q)$ as P acts trivially on Φ and Q/Φ . As P is a Sylow p -subgroup of G , this forces $R = P/Z(Q)$, and thus R is the unique Sylow p -subgroup of N , and thus $S_p(N)$ is connected.

Assume that Q is essential. Then $S_p(N_G(Q)/QC_G(Q))$ is disconnected and therefore $N_G(Q) \neq N_G(Q) \cap N_G(\Phi)$. As the $\Phi(Q)$ is characteristic in Q and is contained in Φ , we have that $\Phi(Q)$ is a proper subgroup of Φ , hence trivial; this gives that Q is elementary abelian. Take $x \in N_G(Q) \setminus N_G(\Phi)$. Now $R = P/Q$ is not contained in $(N_G(Q) \cap N_G({}^x\Phi))/C_G(Q)$; otherwise

$N/C_G(Q)$ and $(N_G(Q) \cap N_G({}^x\Phi))/C_G(Q)$ would have the same Sylow p -subgroup R , implying that $P/Q = {}^x(P/Q)$ and thus that x normalizes P . It follows that $\Phi = {}^x\Phi$, which is in contradiction with the choice of x . As ${}^x\Phi$ is a subgroup of P of order p , the vector subspace ${}^x\Phi/(Z(P) \cap {}^x\Phi)$ of $P/Z(P)$ admits an orthogonal complement with respect to β which is either all $P/Z(P)$ or a hyperplane. This gives that $|P : C_P({}^x\Phi)| = 1$ or p . If Q is a proper subgroup of $C_P({}^x\Phi)$, then $C_P({}^x\Phi)$ is non-abelian, and therefore $\Phi = \Phi(C_P({}^x\Phi))$. Moreover, ${}^{x^{-1}}(C_P({}^x\Phi)/Q) \subset (C_{N_G(Q)}(\Phi)/Q)$ so, by Sylow's theorem, there exists $c \in (C_{N_G(Q)}(\Phi)/Q)$ such that ${}^{cx^{-1}}(C_P({}^x\Phi)/Q) \subset (C_P(\Phi)/Q)$. This implies that ${}^{cx^{-1}}\Phi = \Phi$, which is equivalent to $\Phi = {}^x\Phi$, and we obtain once again a contradiction. Hence $Q = C_P({}^x\Phi)$ and $|P : Q| = p$. We also have that $Q/Z(P)$ is a maximal isotropic subspace of $P/Z(P)$; it follows that $|P : Z(P)| = p^2$. Moreover, $C_P({}^x\Phi)$ is a proper subgroup of P , so ${}^x\Phi$ is not contained in $Z(P)$, implying that $Z(P) \neq {}^xZ(P)$. By the same type of arguments, taking x^{-1} instead of x , we can also prove that Φ is not contained in ${}^xZ(P)$.

Finally, take $A := Z(P) \cap {}^xZ(P)$. As $|Q : Z(P)| = |Q : {}^xZ(P)| = p$ and $Z(P) \neq {}^xZ(P)$, we obtain that $|Z(P) : A| = p$, so Q/A is isomorphic to $C_p \times C_p$. Moreover, A does not contain Φ so, by Lemma 3.2, $Z(P) \simeq \Phi \times A$ and $P \simeq E \times A$, where E is an extraspecial group of order p^3 . First, as Q/A is isomorphic to $C_p \times C_p$, E cannot be isomorphic to the quaternion group. Second, we will prove that the case where E is isomorphic to $C_{p^2} \rtimes C_p$ also yields to a contradiction. The result is due to Glauberman [MP], but the proof we give, which is more elegant, is due to Jacques Thévenaz.

Let $K := \langle P/Q, {}^x(P/Q) \rangle$, which is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(Q/A)$ viewed as a subgroup of $\text{GL}(2, \mathbf{F}_p)$. As $P/Q \neq {}^x(P/Q)$, they generate all $\text{SL}(2, \mathbf{F}_p)$, so $\text{SL}(2, \mathbf{F}_p)$ is a subgroup of K containing P/Q . Now P/Q is a Sylow p -subgroup of K and we will prove that the exact sequence $1 \rightarrow Q/A \rightarrow E \rightarrow P/Q \rightarrow 1$ can be extended to an exact sequence $1 \rightarrow Q/A \rightarrow L \rightarrow K \rightarrow 1$ and hence to an exact sequence $1 \rightarrow Q/A \rightarrow L' \rightarrow \text{SL}(2, \mathbf{F}_p) \rightarrow 1$. To have this, it suffices to verify [Br, pp. 84–85] that the class $h(E)$ determined by E in $H^2(P/Q, Q/A)$ is K -stable; that is, for any $k \in K$, we have

$$\text{res}_{P/Q \cap {}^k(P/Q)}^{P/Q} h(E) = \text{res}_{P/Q \cap {}^k(P/Q)}^{k(P/Q)} \text{conj}_k(h(E)). \quad (*)$$

Here res is the restriction in cohomology and conj_k is the morphism induced by the conjugation by k in cohomology. If $P/Q \neq {}^k(P/Q)$, then $P/Q \cap {}^k(P/Q) = 1$ and the relation $(*)$ is trivially satisfied. Suppose that $P/Q = {}^k(P/Q)$. Take \tilde{k} to be a representative of k in $N_G(Q)$ that normalizes P . We have that \tilde{k} induces the conjugation by k on Q and P/Q . So the conjugation by \tilde{k} induces conj_k on $H^2(P/Q, Q/A)$. Thus

$h(E) = \text{conj}_k(h(E))$ and $(*)$ is again satisfied. Now, for $E \simeq C_{p^2} \rtimes C_p$, $h(E)$ is not trivial.

The contradiction comes from the fact that $H^2(\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_p), Q/A) = 0$, so the cohomology class $h(E)$ induced by E in $H^2(P/Q, Q/A)$ would be trivial. Indeed let $U := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & * \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ be a Sylow p -subgroup of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_p)$. Write $S := \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_p)$ and $N(U) := N_{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}_p)}(U)$. The restriction to U in cohomology induces a monomorphism $\text{res}_U^S: H^2(S, Q) \rightarrow H^2(U, Q)^{N(U)}$, where $H^2(U, Q)^{N(U)}$ are the fixed points under the natural action of $N(U)$. Now $U = \langle u \rangle$ is a cyclic group, so [Be, p. 60] its cohomology is

$$H^2(U, Q) = Q^U / \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} u^i \right) v \mid v \in Q \right\}.$$

By a simple computation, we obtain $Q^U = \langle z \rangle$, where z is a generator of $\Phi(P)$ and $\{(\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} u^i)v \mid v \in Q\} = 0$, so $H^2(U, Q) = \langle z \rangle$. As z is not fixed by $N(U)$, we have $H^2(U, Q)^{N(U)} = 0$, and therefore $H^2(S, Q) = 0$.

We prove now that the remaining case, $P = E \times A$ with E either dihedral of order 8 (when $p = 2$) or extraspecial of order p^3 and exponent p (when p is odd), is indeed an exception to Theorem 4.2. Let us start with a property of resistant groups:

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Let P be a p -group and let B be a finite abelian p -group. If P is not resistant, then the direct product $P \times B$ is not resistant.*

Proof. Let G be a finite group with P as Sylow p -subgroup and let Q be an essential p -subgroup of G embedded in P . Such a G exists because we suppose that P is not resistant. In this case, $\tilde{P} := P \times B$ is a Sylow p -subgroup of $\tilde{G} := G \times B$. As Q is p -centric in P , so is $\tilde{Q} := Q \times B$ in \tilde{P} . Moreover, $N_{\tilde{G}}(\tilde{Q})/\tilde{Q}C_{\tilde{G}}(\tilde{Q}) \simeq N_G(Q)/QC_G(Q)$. This means that, as $\mathcal{S}_p(N_G(Q)/QC_G(Q))$ is disconnected, so is $\mathcal{S}_p(N_{\tilde{G}}(\tilde{Q})/\tilde{Q}C_{\tilde{G}}(\tilde{Q}))$. Then \tilde{Q} is an essential p -subgroup of \tilde{G} . This proves that \tilde{P} is not resistant.

PROPOSITION 4.5. *Let $P = E \times A$, where A is elementary abelian and E is dihedral of order 8 (when $p = 2$) or of order p^3 and exponent p (when p is odd). Then P is not resistant.*

Proof. We can realize E as a Sylow p -subgroup of $\text{GL}(3, \mathbb{F}_p)$. One can verify that

$$Q_1 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & * \\ 0 & 1 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & * & * \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

are essential subgroups of G . So E is not resistant. As P is isomorphic to $E \times A$, where A is elementary abelian, by Proposition 4.4, P is not resistant.

In a very recent paper [Pu2], Puig introduced the notion of “full Frobenius system,” which is a category over a finite p -group P whose objects are the subgroups of P and whose morphisms are a set of injective morphisms between the subgroups of P containing the conjugation by the elements of P . The morphisms satisfy some natural axioms which are inspired by the local properties of P when P is a Sylow p -subgroup of a finite group or a defect group of a block in a group algebra. Puig defined in this context the concept of “essential group” and proved that, on a full Frobenius system, the analog of Alperin’s Fusion Theorem holds. Full Frobenius systems are the generalization of the Frobenius category of a group, and of the Brauer and Puig categories of a block.

The theorem in this paper remains true and all the arguments were chosen to remain valid in a full Frobenius system over P . This permits us to generalize the results to Brauer pairs and pointed groups.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Rhada Kesser and Markus Linckelmann for their precious suggestions. I am indebted to Prof. Lluís Puig for suggesting the fact that we can extend the main theorem to full Frobenius systems. I am also indebted to the referee for the simplifications in the proof of the main theorem. I am deeply grateful to Prof. Jacques Thévenaz for his mathematical and moral support throughout this work.

REFERENCES

- [Al] J. Alperin, Sylow intersections and fusion, *J. Algebra* **6** (1967), 222–241.
- [Be] D. J. Benson, “Representations and Cohomology I,” Cambridge Studies in Advanced Math. Vol. 30, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991.
- [Br] K. Brown, “Cohomology of Groups,” Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.
- [Gol] D. M. Goldschmidt, A conjugation family for finite groups, *J. Algebra* **16** (1970), 138–142.
- [Gor] D. Gorenstein, “Finite Groups,” Harper Series in Modern Maths., pp. 138–142, 1968.
- [GM] D. J. Green and P. A. Minh, Almost all extraspecial p -groups are Swan groups, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **62** (2000), 149–154.
- [MP] J. Martino and S. Priddy, On the cohomology and homotopy of Swan groups. *Math. Z.* **225** (1997), 277–288.
- [Mi] G. Mislin, On group homomorphism inducing mod- p cohomology isomorphism, *Comment. Math. Helv.* **65** (1990), 454–461.
- [Pu1] L. Puig, Structure locale dans les groupes finis, *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, Mémoire no. 47, 1976.
- [Pu2] L. Puig, Full Frobenius systems and their localizing categories, preprint.
- [Th] J. Thévenaz, “G-Algebras and Modular Representation Theory,” Oxford Science Publications, New York, 1995.